

Meeting Minutes Facilities Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, December 10, 2008  
Madison County Courthouse  
Virginia City, MT

People Present: Chairman John Scully, Commissioner Dave Schulz, Kim Hudson, MaryLou Freese, Karen Brown, Toni James, Paul Marsh, John Hamilton, Linda Hamilton, Dave Schenk, Pat Bradley, Frank Nelson, Dona Lindsey, Vergil Lindsey, Nancy Ragain, Dale Ragain, Linsu Zimmer, Justin Gatewood, Roger Williams, G Karl Marcus, Marge Antolik, Angela Mueller

The meeting was called to order at 5:30pm.

The minutes from the last meeting were approved with no changes.

Chairman Scully announced that use of the Lee Property was passed for use by the V.C. City Council. Access issues are still a problem, and a few members of the community were opposed to it. The city approved it for use for county offices.

Chairman Scully then opened the floor for presentations. They were chosen in no particular order. The presentations were given as follows (a hard copy of all presentations was mailed to all interested parties on December 4):

1. Kim Hudson
2. Pat Bradley
3. Ragain-Lindsey
4. Frank Nelson
5. Concerned Citizens Group (represented by Linsu Zimmer)
6. Bill Hanley (not present – outline of proposal given by Chairman Scully)

Chairman Scully laid out the procedure for voting on the presentations, but first went through a series of votes to simplify the main points brought up in all presentations.

The following is the series of topics and votes:

Go with the original plan across from the courthouse

Subset questions:

Office only: Yes – 9

No – 9

Modify original plan: Yes – 6

No – 12

Original plan as currently written: Yes – 4

No – 13

How is the project to be paid for: Mill Levy – 9

Bond – 7

Should a study group be started to see if the old schoolhouse can be:

Renovated: Yes – 7

No – 8

Donated: Yes – 10

No – 7

The commissioners should do the Half Expansion of the courthouse:

Yes – 5

No – (no 'no' vote was taken)

The commissioners should do the Full Expansion of the courthouse:

Yes – 10

No – (no 'no' vote was taken)

The commissioners should do nothing to the courthouse:

Yes – 4

No – (no 'no' vote was taken)

In the future, should the current courthouse be used as a justice facility?

Yes – 7

No – 7

Should the current courthouse be used as a community facility only?

Yes – 12

No – 1

Should the Lee House be used for short-term emergency use and for use during construction of other office space?

Yes – 9

No – 2

Should the commissioners look into remodeling of the Pankey House?

Yes – 6

No – 11

Should the commission keep in future considerations the Stevens property, Jarvis property or other properties?

Yes – 7

No – 2

Regarding the jail, should the commissioners do:

Nothing – 0

Something – 17

Regarding the jail size, should the commissioners consider:

The most recent ballot proposal – 2

A modified version of the ballot proposal – 17

Should the location be:

1. Next to the schoolhouse: Yes – 0

No – 14

2. Across from the courthouse: Yes – 6

No – 12

3. Outside the town of VC: Yes – 13

No – 5

4. In the current jail location, but remodeled: Yes – 1

No – 12

Chairman Scully then handed out ballots regarding all of the different proposals that had been presented earlier in the meeting. The group voted, and the results are the following:

The numbers correlating to the presentations are as follows:

#1. Kim Hudson

#2. Pat Bradley

#3. Ragain-Lindsey

#4. Frank Nelson

#5. Concerned Citizens Group

#6. Bill Hanley

First place (meaning the number of votes correlating to the presentation number was the voters' favorite proposal)

#1 – 2 votes

#2 – 3 votes

#3 – 6 votes

#4 – 2 votes

#5 – 5 votes

#6 – 0 votes

Second Place (meaning the number of votes correlating to the presentation number was the voters' second favorite proposal)

#1 – 5 votes

#2 – 3 votes

#3 – 2 votes

#4 – 3 votes

#5 – 0 votes

#6 – 0 votes

Third Place (meaning the number of votes correlating to the presentation number was the voters' third favorite proposal)

#1 – 5 votes

#2 – 1 vote

#3 – 2 votes

#4 – 1 vote

#5 – 2 votes

#6 – 0 votes

Fourth Place (meaning the number of votes correlating to the presentation number was the voters' fourth favorite proposal)

#1 – 1 vote

#2 – 1 vote

#3 – 2 votes

#4 – 1 vote

#5 – 1 vote

#6 – 4 votes

Fifth Place (meaning the number of votes correlating to the presentation number was the voters' fifth favorite proposal)

#1 – 1 vote

#2 – 2 votes

#3 – 1 vote

#4 – 3 votes

#5 – 3 votes

#6 – 2 votes

Sixth Place (meaning the number of votes correlating to the presentation number was the voters' sixth favorite proposal)

#1 – 0 votes

#2 – 2 votes

#3 – 2 votes

#4 – 2 votes

#5 – 2 votes

#6 – 4 votes

Chairman Scully thanked the group for its efforts and dedication to this process.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm.